

### **Remarks**

The Office Action mailed July 7, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment and following remarks have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, 19, and 20 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, 19, and 20 stand rejected. Claims 4, 11, and 18 were objected to and have been canceled.

The rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lasche (US 1,534,721) in view of Tomko (US 6,352,405) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 4 has been canceled and independent Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the recitations of Claim 4. Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Lasche in view of Tomko.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2 and 3 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2 and 3 likewise are patentable over Lasche in view of Tomko.

Claim 11 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 11 has been canceled and independent Claim 5 has been amended to include all of the recitations of Claim 11. Accordingly, Claim 5 is submitted to be patentable over Lasche in view of Tomko.

Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 depend from independent Claim 5. When the recitations of Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 5, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 likewise are patentable over Lasche in view of Tomko.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-10 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 8, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lasche (US 1,534,721) in view of Tomko (US 6,352,405), as applied to Claim 5 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 11 has been canceled and independent Claim 5 has been amended to include all of the recitations of Claim 11. Accordingly, Claim 5 is submitted to be patentable over Lasche in view of Tomko.

Claims 8, 12, and 13 depend from independent Claim 5. When the recitations of Claims 8, 12, and 13 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 5, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 8, 12, and 13 likewise are patentable over Lasche in view of Tomko.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 8, 12, and 13 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 14-17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lasche (US 1,534,721) in view of Tomko (US 6,352,405) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 18 has been canceled and independent Claim 14 has been amended to include all of the recitations of Claim 18. Accordingly, Claim 14 is submitted to be patentable over Lasche in view of Tomko.

Claims 15-17, 19, and 20 depend from independent Claim 14. When the recitations of Claims 15-17, 19, and 20 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 14,

Applicants submit that dependent Claims 15-17, 19, and 20 likewise are patentable over Lasche in view of Tomko.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 14-17, 19, and 20 be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 11, and 18 were indicated as objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Claim 4 has been canceled and independent Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 4. Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 11 has been canceled and independent Claim 5 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 11. Accordingly, Claim 5 is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 18 has been canceled and independent Claim 14 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 18. Accordingly, Claim 14 is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert B. Reeser III  
Registration No. 45,548  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070